

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,495	01/02/2001	Jeffrey H. Sherman	AVISTA/209-1014	2162
7590 10/28/2004		EXAMINER		
THOMASON ATTN: N. ALE	, MOSER & PATTERS XANDER NOLTE	SON, L.L.P.	GRIFFIN, WALTER DEAN	
3040 POST OA	K BLVD.,		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1500 Houston, TX	77056		. 1764	

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<del>-</del>
Office Action Summan	09/753,495	SHERMAN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Walter D. Griffin	1764	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communic	eation.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 Oc	<u>ctober 2004</u> .		
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merit	s is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	i3 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) <u>4,6-9,11-13,16-22,25-28,31,32,34-36</u>	and 39-42 is/are pending in the a	application	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration	ррпоацоп.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) <u>4,6-9,11-13,16-22,25-28,31,32,34-36</u>	and 39-42 is/are rejected.		
7)☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	;		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce		xaminer.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the d			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	1(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)∏ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ∣	priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(a).	-(d) or (f)	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	(d) 01 (i).	
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No	
<ol><li>Copies of the certified copies of the priori</li></ol>	ty documents have been received		
application from the International Bureau			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list o	of the certified copies not received	i.	
Attachment/c)		,	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) T 1-42	DTO 440)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)	-1 (U-413) e	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>091704</u> .		tent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 1764

Ý

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 12, 2004 has been entered.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

Application/Control Number: 09/753,495

Art Unit: 1764

9

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 7-9, 13, 16, 18-22, 25-28, 31, 32, 34-36, and 39-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 97/00928.

The WO 97/00928 reference discloses a process for refining used oil. The process comprises contacting the oil with an alkaline reactant in the presence of a solvent such as ethylene glycol. Following the contacting, contaminants are removed from the oil by, among other steps, distillation. See the entire document and column 3, lines 7-55 and column 4, lines 1-47 of equivalent US patent 6,072,065.

The WO reference does not disclose that the used oil is the various claimed used oils that contain light hydrocarbons, does not disclose the distillation conditions, and does not disclose the amounts of base or glycol.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of the WO 97/00928 reference by using a raw oil that contains light hydrocarbons in the process because any oil that does not contain tarry materials would be expected to be effectively treated in the process. The preliminary distillation step of the WO 97/00928 reference is important in that it separates tarry material from the oil. Therefore, if the oil does not contain tarry material, one would eliminate the preliminary distillation step since its function would not be needed. By eliminating this step, a raw used oil would be treated in the process of the WO 97/00928 reference.

It also would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of the WO 97/00928 reference by selecting

4

Art Unit: 1764

distillation conditions that would effectively separate the contaminants from the oil including the specific conditions claimed because the range of distillation conditions disclosed in the WO reference indicates that such conditions are selected to obtain desired fractions. One of ordinary skill select appropriate conditions within the framework disclosed by the WO reference in order to produce desired products.

It also would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of the WO reference by using any amounts of base and glycol including the claimed amounts because one of ordinary skill in the art would adjust such amounts to provide the disclosed effect of contaminant removal.

### Response to Arguments

The examiner believes that the arguments put forth by applicants in the response of October 12, 2004 have been addressed by the rejection discussed above.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Walter D. Griffin whose telephone number is (571) 272-1447. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6:30 to 4:00 with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1764

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

What D. Doff Walter D. Griffin Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1764

WG October 27, 2004